

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,511	08/23/2003	Garold B. Bitner II	4007M	9665	
7590 11/15/2004		EXAMINER .			
S. Michael Bender P.O. Box 530399			REDMAN,	REDMAN, JERRY E	
St. Petersburg,	•		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3634		
			DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/646,511	BITNER, GAROLD B			
Unice Act	ion Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jerry Redman	3634			
The MAILING Deriod for Reply	PATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STA THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be a after SIX (6) MONTHS from - If the period for reply specifi If NO period for reply is specifi Failure to reply within the se	OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Ivailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 the mailing date of this communication. ed above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply cified above, the maximum statutory period w t or extended period for reply will, by statute, ffice later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to o	communication(s) filed on 23 Au	igust 2003.				
2a) This action is F	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this appli						
closed in accord	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		·				
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is 7) ☐ Claim(s)	s/are rejected.	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
10)☐ The drawing(s) f Applicant may no Replacement dra	t request that any objection to the owing sheet(s) including the correct	r. epted or b) objected to by the formula of the formula of the formula of the formula of the drawing(s) is objected of the drawing(s) is objected of the formula of the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119					
a) All b) Son 1. Certified 2. Certified 3. Copies of application	me * c) None of: copies of the priority documents copies of the priority documents f the certified copies of the prior on from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	od (DTO 802)	∆\ □ 	(PTO 442)			
	Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) atement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3634

The applicant's information disclosure statement dated 8/23/2003 has been considered and a copy has been scanned.

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 2, line 2, it is not readily apparent to the Examiner if the applicant is claiming a bug barrier apparatus or a bug barrier apparatus in combination with a door. In claim 2, line 2, the applicant is clearly and positively claiming the door but in claim 1, the applicant fails to positively recite the door. If the applicant intends to claim the combination then the applicant should clearly and positively recite the barrier in combination with the door. In claim 6, line 3, the phraseology "frame-like" is indefinite and fails to positively recite the claimed invention. Is it a frame or not? In claim 8, lines 1-2, the phraseology "comprised of foam, double stick, adhesive tapes" is not readily understood by the Examiner. What is the difference between "adhesive tapes" and "adhesive strips"? Does the applicant mean that the adhesive tapes (or strips) comprised of double-stick foam? \

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,511

Art Unit: 3634

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murase et al. As shown in Figure 14, Murase et al. disclose a bug barrier apparatus comprising a sliding door (55), a support member (labeled as 50 in Figure 12) having flexible bristles (49) connected to a bottom end of the support member (50), a door attachment means (projections 51), and a track (64) contacted by the flexible bristles (49) during sliding movement of the sliding door (55). The support member (50) further comprising a thru channel defined by a top end, a bottom end, and a pair of riser portions, which defines a four-sided configuration.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase et al. in view of Patent application publication to Meizlish. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing the attachment means has double sided foam adhesive strips/tape. Patent application publication to Meizlish discloses a weatherstrip mounted via double-sided foam adhesive tape. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the support member of Murase et al. to be attached to the sliding door via double sided foam adhesive tape as taught by Meizlish since double sided foam adhesive tape allows one to easily mount and replace the support member along the edge of the sliding door.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,511

Art Unit: 3634

Page 4

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. U.S. patent to Yanagizawa et al. disclose a sealing member

attached to an edge of a sliding member and mounted via adhesive. As shown in

Figure 10, U.S. patent to Trelle discloses a sliding panel having a sealing member

adhesively attached similar to that of the applicant's invention. U.S. patent to Rich

discloses a sealing apparatus attached to a leading edge of a sliding panel similar to

that of the applicant's invention. French patent to Agostinho et al. disclose a sealing

apparatus contacting a track similar to that of the applicant's invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman

at telephone number 703-308-2120.

Jerry Redman Primary Examiner